

ENTERED

December 12, 2017

David J. Bradley, Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

EPHRAIN RELIFORD,
Plaintiff,

§
§
§
§

v.

§ CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:16-CV-482

DEAN J. CRAIG, et. al.,
Defendant.

§
§
§

ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION


On November 22, 2017, United States Magistrate Judge B. Janice Ellington issued her “Memorandum and Recommendation” on Defendants’ motion for summary judgment. D.E. 27. The parties were provided proper notice and an opportunity to object to the Magistrate Judge’s Memorandum and Recommendation. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

When no timely objection to a magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation is filed, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record and accept the magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation. *Guillory v. PPG Industries, Inc.*, 434 F.3d 303, 308 (5th Cir. 2005) (citing *Douglass v. United Services Auto Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996)).

Plaintiff did not file timely objections. The Court has reviewed the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the Magistrate Judge’s Memorandum and Recommendation (D.E. 27), and all other relevant documents in the record, and finding no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** as its own the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Defendants’ motion for summary

judgment and **ORDERS** that this action be **DISMISSED** with prejudice. The Clerk shall enter this order and provide a copy to all parties.

It is so ORDERED this 12 day of Dec, 2017.


HAYDEN HEAD
SENIOR U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE